

Subscription by Mail—Post-paid.
DAILY, Per Month..... \$3.00
DAILY, Per Year..... \$30.00
SUNDAY, Per Year..... \$5.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... \$35.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month..... \$3.00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year..... \$30.00
Foreign Postage added.
THE SUN, New York City.

Bishop Potter on Faith and Dogma.

Bishop POTTER delivered a "Charge to the Clergy" at the late diocesan convention of the Episcopal Church, in which he defined with great caution the bounds within which ministers must be restrained by the faith and order of the Church. He drew a distinction between the "consistent and unvarying teaching of the Church" from the beginning and the points of doctrine as to which there has been disagreement and the terms of theology which have received no precise and authoritative definition. In the one case full and hearty acceptance is requisite as a matter of both honor and duty in the case of one who is pledged to preach and sustain the faith of the Church. In the other he can exercise his "catholic liberty" without doing violence to the order of the Church.

No clergyman, for instance, can consistently and honorably retain his office if he has lost his "faith in the supernatural element in the Holy Scriptures or in the person and work of Christ." If by prayer and mortification he cannot recover the belief, he is at war with the Church, and should part company with it. He has put himself outside of the household of faith, and he is, in fact, false to his own conscience and treacherous to the Church if he continues in his priestly office. But he may entertain theories of inspiration and hold and affirm views of the origin and character of the threefold ministry of the Church which are not universal among its clergy, but which have not been authoritatively and precisely forbidden by contrary declaration and decision.

That is about the sum of the Bishop's argument, as we make it out. The implication is that Mr. MACQUARRY could not honestly remain in the Episcopal Church after rejecting the virgin birth of Jesus, for that is the positive and unvarying faith of the Church continually and continuously affirmed in its formularies. Manifestly this position of the Bishop is unassailable. What he says is mere common sense. A flat atheist would be hardly more out of place in the Episcopal Church than was Mr. MACQUARRY. He could not recite its creeds and read its collects without falsifying his real convictions. In an Episcopal pulpit he was a false pretender.

If we interpret Bishop POTTER rightly, Dr. Briggs, however, would not be debared from the Episcopal ministry by his views and theories of the Scriptures and Scriptural inspiration. The Bishop makes a distinction between the Protestantism of Milton, Locke, and Hume, and the subsequence "American Puritan theology." In the latter the authority of the Bible. The superstitious veneration of the letter of the canonical Scriptures, as Dr. Briggs calls it, is "the fruit of a very modern Protestantism," says the Bishop. The Catholic teaching is that the Church can alone determine the canon of Scripture; but that doctrine implies the infallibility of the Church. The Protestant view is, in general, that the authenticity and authority of the Bible must be determined by external evidence as to the history of the books and internal evidence showing their Divine origin. That teaching gives as much right to an individual as to a Church to dispute and discover revelation and inspiration. Emerson, Lyman, and Cary throw out certain books of the New Testament and were doubtful about others which our "American Puritan theology" declares to be the veritable and incontestable Word of God. Dr. Briggs and Dr. Vincent exercise a right claimed by the fathers of the Reformation, though they go further and dispute the authorship of books of the Old Testament by those to whom they are attributed in the canonical Scriptures.

As to the Episcopal Church, Bishop POTTER distinctly affirms that it admits that the Bible "includes both a human element and a divine element," and he declares that "it is entirely competent for any one in holy orders, whether bishop, priest, or deacon, to say, as Emerson, Lyman, and Cary say with emphasis, that 'the Church has not anywhere, nor at any time, committed herself to any dogmatic definition of the meaning of inspiration.'" The question, then, is open for discussion and difference of opinions. So also the prevalent Episcopal view of the apostolic succession is the view of a party and not a precise and authoritative dogma of the Church. Consequently the attempt to keep Dr. PHILLIPS Brooks from the episcopate because he did not agree with it is denounced by Bishop POTTER as ignorant and unjustifiable. From the first days of the Episcopal Church in America the House of Bishops has contained men who agreed with Dr. Brooks and not with the prevalent view of the subject.

This charge of Bishop POTTER, accordingly, is of great importance. But where does it leave the question of the authority of the Scriptures? If the Church determines it, we must have an infallible Church. If the individual is to settle it according to his own reason and perception, the individual conscience and judgment are the supreme authority, and there is no fixed and absolute body of revelation in which belief can be required as a test of faith. Every man can take or reject what he pleases. If there is "no dogmatic definition of the meaning of inspiration," every man can define it for himself, and the absolute and universal authority of the Bible as a rule of faith and practice is gone.

The Church and Marriage.

Four young people, two young men and two young women, went to St. Mark's Church last Tuesday, and in a short time they left the church as two married couples. One pair were married by the rector, the Rev. Dr. RYLAND, the other acting as the only witnesses, and then his assistant proposed to join those others in holy matrimony, those already wedded serving, in their turn, as the only witnesses.

Of course, it was obvious to the clergyman that these young people came to get married without parental knowledge and consent, and against parental wish and judgment. One of the grooms had notified Dr. RYLAND previously that there was some opposition on the part of his intended bride's parents. The circumstance that the four only were present at the church, the parents of none of them being there, indicated plainly why the young people wanted to be married clandestinely.

It seems that the young women, who are sisters, came to town with their mother on the day of their marriage, and, on the pre-

tence of doing some shopping, they left her to join the young men and accompany them to St. Mark's Church. Their father was in Europe, and he had asked that the one of them who had spoken to him on the subject of the marriage should give him further time to consider it. For some reason both of her parents hesitated to give their consent to the union, if they did not actually oppose and forbid it. Hence the young couple resorted to this deceit and this secrecy. The men also were not willing to wait to win over their bride's parents, but went ahead without regard to them.

In such precipitancy there is nothing surprising so far as they were concerned. It is an old story. But Dr. RYLAND was in no such case. He could be cool and deliberate, and he could have used his influence to restrain the impetuosity of the young people, so careless of parental judgment and parental desire and solicitude. Moreover, the young man for whom Dr. RYLAND officiated was known to him as one of his parishioners, and the young woman is of a family of which he must have possessed information. They were not a casual couple coming to him to be joined in wedlock by the rites and with the blessing of the Church. What he did not know about them already he could easily have learned by questioning them.

Their seeking a secret marriage was in itself ground for suspicion and reason for investigation. The bride's mother was in town; why was she not at the wedding? As a clergyman he teaches that by the commandment of God parents must be honored, that the parental authority must be respected, and that the family must be preserved as a divine institution. Yet he countenanced and encouraged these young people in their rebellion against parental authority. He did not counsel them as a spiritual guide. He abetted them in their rebellion and made himself a party to their deceitful game. He did not communicate with the parents or try to advise with them. He performed the solemn ceremony, took his fee, and left the church at once, being very busy, as he says. Then his assistant accepted a fee for marrying the other pair. This was manifestly a marriage entered into with the adventitious spirit of youth, probably as a sudden decision of a girl of nineteen and a young fellow but lately out of college, and yet the clergyman performed the solemn ceremony, knowing that the parents of the bride were ignorant of what was being done, so momentous in its consequences to her, to her family, and to society. He treated marriage as if it were a trivial matter, a sort of practical joke, and he gave the sanction of the Church to deceit practised on parents and to disregard of their reasonable wishes and precautions.

In other words, the Rev. Dr. RYLAND and his assistant have published abroad that the Episcopal Church, so far as it is represented by them, is ready to abet clandestine marriages, and that it recognizes no right in parents to be consulted as to the marriage of their children, and no duty to parents on the part of children.

Mr. Gladstone Speaks.

If in the minds of British Liberals there had been awakened any doubt regarding Mr. GLADSTONE's physical and mental condition, the incident of his speech at Newcastle, his memorable speech at Newcastle, his voice retains the resonant and carrying quality for which it used to be prominent, we are not as yet informed. But the cable report demonstrates that never has his utterance been more lucid, better ordered, more cogent, or more eloquent. The reader even of the telegraphed summary must more than once experience the impression of thought by feeling which is the supreme achievement of the orator.

Speaking at Newcastle, where so lately took place the Trade Union Congress, it was natural that Mr. GLADSTONE should begin by enumerating the grounds on which the Liberal party, that doubt will have been entirely dispelled, his memorable speech at Newcastle. Whether, indeed, his voice retains the resonant and carrying quality for which it used to be prominent, we are not as yet informed. But the cable report demonstrates that never has his utterance been more lucid, better ordered, more cogent, or more eloquent. The reader even of the telegraphed summary must more than once experience the impression of thought by feeling which is the supreme achievement of the orator.

Speaking at Newcastle, where so lately took place the Trade Union Congress, it was natural that Mr. GLADSTONE should begin by enumerating the grounds on which the Liberal party, that doubt will have been entirely dispelled, his memorable speech at Newcastle. Whether, indeed, his voice retains the resonant and carrying quality for which it used to be prominent, we are not as yet informed. But the cable report demonstrates that never has his utterance been more lucid, better ordered, more cogent, or more eloquent. The reader even of the telegraphed summary must more than once experience the impression of thought by feeling which is the supreme achievement of the orator.

As regards the difficult eight-hour question, Mr. GLADSTONE forebore for the moment to pronounce any absolute judgment, on the reasonable ground that the question had not yet by the bulk of the country been sufficiently examined. But the tenor of his remarks upon the subject could leave no doubt in the hearer's mind that, once convinced that such a measure was demanded by the great majority of workmen, he would cheerfully assent to the enactment of a statutory eight-hour day. He assumed the same attitude of friendly impartiality touching the controversy whether Scotch or Welsh disestablishment should first receive Parliamentary consideration. Toward, finally, the Radical agitation for the abolition of the House of Lords, Mr. GLADSTONE took up a position which, while ostensibly conservative, was really fraught with the gravest menace. It lay, he said, with the Peers themselves to determine whether the Radical project should remain for some time in the shade. They alone could convert it from an accidental and distant question into one both proximate and burning. They would surely do this if they listened to the counsel of Lord SALISBURY, who had recently assured the Unionists that even if the House of Commons should pass a Home Rule bill, they might still rely upon the play of other parts of the Constitution. Should the peers

be so ill-advised as to try to thwart the will of the nation, he, Mr. GLADSTONE, would then tell the Liberals that the question of the abolition of the upper House should have precedence over every other, because then upon that alone would hinge the fundamental question whether the British people are self-governing, or whether there be another power thrust between the people and the throne and able to block the action of the constitutional machine.

To the friends of Ireland, while they recognize the propriety of placing British reform in the foreground of a speech addressed to British electors, it may seem that Mr. GLADSTONE kept the good wine for the last. But while the solemn reiteration of his promise to restore home rule to Ireland was reserved for the close of this great speech, he by no means meant his auditors to infer that it would come latest in the legislative programme of the next Liberal Government. On the contrary, he proposed that the first of the chief duties resting on the British Liberals was the duty of rendering justice to their Irish brethren. Never, he said, would the House of Commons overtake the arrears in public business until the Irish question had been put out of the way forever. The approaching verdict of the nation could, he said, be forecast from the outcome of nearly a hundred by-elections, in which a great majority of the electors voting had expressed the deliberate conviction that a just and generous treatment of their fellow subjects in Ireland was imposed upon them alike by their honor, their interest, and their duty before God and man.

Mr. Flower as the Friend of the Union Soldier.

The kind heart of the Hon. ROWELL P. FLOWER has led him much further in the matter of voting pensions than THE SUN can follow him with approval. During his two terms in Congress he has not only been assiduous in procuring the passage of pension bills in individual cases where his own constituents and people in other New York districts were interested, but he has also steadily advocated a policy of liberality in the general pension legislation, no matter at what cost to the Government.

In this direction, we think, Mr. FLOWER went too far while in Congress. As an illustration of Mr. FLOWER's position with regard to pensions, and also of his readiness in debate, we quote an interesting passage from the Congressional Record of March 21, 1890. Mr. FLOWER, of Iowa, repeated the ancient fiction that the armies of the Union were mainly composed of Republican soldiers. Mr. FLOWER was promptly on his legs, and then the subjoined dialogue occurred:

"Mr. FLOWER, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa has been reading, I presume, from Mr. Garrison's Almanac when he states that only one-fourth of the men who fought the battles of the Union were Democrats."

"A Member—Is not that good authority?"

"Mr. FLOWER—Yes, and I want to quote from that source on another point. You will find it stated that ABRAHAM LINCOLN, in 1860, received 1,800,000 votes, or nearly all from the Northern States. The next year he went to war, and from that time until 1864, 2,000,000 soldiers were enlisted to fight in that battle of 1860, 1,800,000 more than the total number of Democrats in 1860. Now, I say to the gentleman from Iowa that the Republican party carried every Northern State, including New Jersey."

Mr. FLOWER—Does not the gentleman know that 60 per cent. of those who enlisted were under the voting age?"

"Mr. FLOWER—I say that every Northern State, including New Jersey, was carried by the Democrats in 1860. I say that the Democrats were at the front (applause on the Democratic side.) And never, Mr. Chairman, until those soldiers got back did those Democrats have a chance to carry a Northern State, and then they made a clean sweep. (Laughter and applause.) I say the majority of the men who fought in the last war were Democrats. The men who were the spaulds were Republicans. The men who carried the war were Democrats. That is one of the reasons why we are so favorable to liberal pensions to the soldiers. (Laughter on the Republican side and applause on the Democratic side.) We believe, your three surgeons in every Congressional district throughout the United States, that these persons should be honestly awarded to the soldiers. We believe in these pension laws, and are willing to make this bill \$124,000,000 instead of \$98,000,000. (Here the name of the bill was called.)"

Although Mr. FLOWER, as we think, has been too indiscriminate in his willingness to vote individual pensions and to favor costly extensions of the pension list, he deserves great credit for this witty and spirited refutation of the venerable Republican lie about the political complexion of the Union armies.

There is another respect in which Mr. FLOWER's course has been indiscriminate. In advocating or voting pensions to Union soldiers or Union soldiers' widows, he has never discriminated, so far as we know, between Republicans and Democrats.

Boulanger—A Last Word.

It was said by the enemies of a Roman Empire who were hissing him, nothing in his life would make him like the ending of these days, although men have ceased to be awayed by the Stoic philosophy, there are still some who deem it not dishonorable to die in what BACON called the high Roman fashion. The Paris *Débat*, for example, one of BOUTANGER's implacable opponents, which had no word of approval for him living, cannot find it in its heart to cast a slur upon his self-sought grave. It evinces no sympathy with those who shudder at the sight of a dentist's chair, yet who, when they hear of a man's putting a pistol to his head, are fond of invoking with smug complacency "the Almighty's canon against self-slaughter."

The *Débat*, on the contrary, acknowledges that BOUTANGER, who has not lived like a man for whom death has no terrors. And not unaptly does his friend ROCHERFORT recall the fact that the soldier who had deliberately refused to outlive the woman that he loved him came out of the war with Prussia almost to pieces, and that his most shattering wound was received in a gallant sortie from Paris, where some of his present detractors were skulking in cellars to escape the dreaded impact of the enemy's shells.

It is but justice to a man who can now have no interested defenders to recognize that BOUTANGER tells the truth in his political testament when he says that the charges accepted by his enemies as proven upon the turf that covered the body of the political tribune. It is a fact that BOUTANGER in his capacity of Minister of War had made a corrupt and treasonable use of the secret service fund should in accordance with the dictates of equity and common sense have been examined either by a court martial or by the ordinary law courts, and not by a political assembly like the French Senate, in which his accusers were assured beforehand of an immense subservient majority. It is a fact that the Procureur-Général, after reviewing the pretended incriminatory evidence, pronounced it impossible to frame on it a valid indictment, and resigned his office sooner than become a party to what he deemed a shameful prostitution of the quasi-judicial machinery of the legislature. It is a fact that BOUTANGER repeatedly offered to return to Paris and to submit to trial before any ordinary court of law, if his enemies in office would give him a safe conduct, an offer which they never ventured to accept.

It is also a fact that the offences of which

BOUTANGER was accused are insignificant compared with those which his chief opponent, M. COMBES, has been charged in the Chamber of Deputies with having committed in Tonquin, and of which he was deposed to clear himself by a prosecution for libel. It is equally undeniable that nothing imputed to BOUTANGER is comparable in iniquity with the use made of means of intimidation and seduction by the same M. COMBES in his capacity of Minister of the Interior during the campaign that preceded the general election of 1890. There are all facts, unchallenged and unchallengeable, and it would not be worth while to recall them were not men's memories proverbially short about those who have failed.

It is, on the other hand, legitimate criticism and not calumny on the part of political opponents to aver that BOUTANGER had already survived the cause of which he had been the representative. No one, we suppose, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves that it is possible under a republican régime to secure such foreign alliances as may restore France to a place of dignity and influence in Europe. Secondly, under the earnest leadership of Cardinal LAVIGIER and the Bishop of Grenoble—a leadership publicly sanctioned by Leo XIII.—the Catholic voters are beginning to renounce their traditional sympathies with monarchy and to give sincere support to the republic. If, then, BOUTANGER was a fiasco, would deny that the affirmation would be well founded if it were true, as most of the French Radicals pretend, that Boulangerism was only the cloak of a monarchist reaction. There is no doubt that royalism is moribund, if not dead, in France. Chiefly for two reasons. First, the understanding with Russia proves